

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0237104 to Cooper et al. ("*Cooper*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2001/0021998 to Margulis ("*Margulis*").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Claim 1 recites a system including, for example:

the first display device . . .
the second display device includes a display unit for displaying display information for operation including a base device selection button and a plurality of additional buttons for switching image modes and accepting an operating input from a user, an operating input accepting means for accepting an operating input from a user, an operating signal generating means for generating operating signals conforming to display items of the display information for operation as specified by the operating input accepting means, and a communication means for transmitting the operating signals to the base device; and

. . .

(emphasis added).

Cooper discloses a "PVR that allows the user to select one or more encoding formats for recording a selected program" (paragraph 0006). The Examiner correctly states that *Cooper* "fails to teach an operation including a base device selection button and a plurality of additional buttons for switching image modes" (Final Office Action at page 4). *Margulis* does not cure the deficiencies of *Cooper*.

¹ The Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Margulis discloses an apparatus for “implementing a wireless television system” (paragraph 0011). The Examiner cites paragraph 0057 of *Margulis* to allegedly disclose the claimed “display information for operation including a base device selection button and a plurality of additional buttons for switching image modes” (Final Office Action at page 4). This is not correct.

Paragraph 0057 of *Margulis* discloses subsystem processor 518 that may “perform various other functions, including image bit allocation based on a particular configuration of remote TV 158, programmable image resolution with filtered image-size scaling, and identifier-key detection for enabling access to premium programming.” According to this passage, subsystem processor 518 may perform image bit allocation, image resolution, and key detection. The Examiner states that this disclosure “is an indication that *Margulis* is able to manipulate the image switch modes” (Final Office Action at page 4).

Even assuming that *Margulis* can manipulate image switch modes, which Applicants do not concede, this manipulation occurs by subsystem processor 518. In contrast, claim 1 requires a 1) “base device selection button” and 2) “a plurality of additional buttons for switching image modes.” *Margulis* is silent regarding the claimed buttons. Processor manipulation of an image, without the use of buttons, cannot teach or suggest the claimed “display information for operation” including the combination of “a base device selection button and a plurality of additional buttons for switching image modes,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner states that paragraph 0043 of *Margulis* discloses remote TV controls (Final Office Action at page 2). According to this passage of *Margulis*, remote

TV controls 214 “may include conventional controls and programmable controls that may be used by a viewer to control certain operating parameters of wireless television system 110.” As depicted in Fig. 2 of *Margulis*, remote TV controls 214 are displayed on remote TV 158. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that these controls include 1) a “base device selection button” and 2) “a plurality of additional buttons for switching image modes.”

Accordingly, *Cooper* and *Margulis*, even if combined as suggested by the Examiner, fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claims 2-12 and 20 are also allowable at least due to their depending from claim 1. Independent claims 13 and 18 and dependent claims 14-17 and 19 are also allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 3, 2009

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220